

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 KEVIN LAMAR FRAZIER,

No. 2:05-cv-0774-MCE-JFM-P

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

ORDER

14 SPENCER ROWELL, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16 _____/

17 On May 18, 2006, the Magistrate Judge issued an order denying plaintiff's motion for
18 default judgment against defendant Spencer Rowell. On June 19, 2006, plaintiff filed a
19 document styled "Motion to Object." The court construes this document as a request for
20 reconsideration of the May 18, 2006 order. On June 23, 2006, defendant Rowell filed an
21 opposition to plaintiff's motion, and on July 20, 2006, plaintiff filed a reply.

22 Pursuant to E.D. Local Rule 72-303(f), a magistrate judge's orders shall be upheld unless
23 "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." Upon review of the entire file, the court finds that the
24 magistrate judge's ruling was correct.¹

25 _____
26 ¹ Local Rule 72-303(b), states "rulings by Magistrate Judges shall be final if no
reconsideration thereof is sought from the Court within ten court days . . . from the date of

1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

2 1. Plaintiff's June 19, 2006 motion to object is construed as a request for reconsideration
3 of the magistrate judge's May 18, 2006 order; and

4 1. Upon reconsideration, said order is affirmed.

5 DATED: November 8, 2006

6
7 

8 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 service of the ruling on the parties.” E.D. Local Rule 72-303(b). Plaintiff's request for
26 reconsideration of the magistrate judge's order of May 18, 2006 is untimely and could be denied
for that reason. The court has, however, reviewed plaintiff's request on the merits.